

REMARKS

About the Amendments

Amendments to the specification appear either as underlined text (additions) or struck-through text (deletions). The Applicant considers the amendments to be fully supported by the original specification, with no new matter included. The changes are primarily editorial, but some of the changes may address -- or be relevant to -- some of the comments the Examiner has made in the Office Action.

The amendments to the Claims are not narrowing amendments for the purposes of patentability. The amendments are requested to clarify that the claims refer to PVB sheeting made by the process of Claim 1.

Traversal

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Applicant believes that the amendment to Claim 1 is responsive to the Examiner's objection, and thus have clarified the claim in such a way as to not be objectionable for lack of specificity to the claimed invention.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as unpatentable over Phillips in view of Kondo and Ulmann's Encyclopedia of Industrial Chemistry. The Examiner points out that Phillips teaches a process for preparing colored thermoplastic composite sheeting using a color concentrate of pigment chips dispersed in PVB resin binder. The Examiner notes that Phillips does not teach the size of the chips or the molecular weight of the binder. The Examiner states that Kondo teaches use of particles having a size of up to 200 nm. The Examiner also states that Ulmann teaches that low molecular weight PVB is better for use in inks, pigments, etc. The Examiner concludes from the references that the presently claimed invention is obvious.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kondo teaches away from the presently claimed invention. Kondo, at column 2, lines 25 - 27, teach that the ultra-fine particles provide the function of colorlessness to a glass laminate. Thus, one looking to use the teachings of Kondo to provide a colored laminate of the present invention would be discouraged from the teaching that the ultra-fine particles provide colorlessness to the laminate. Even though Kondo states that a desired color tone can be provided (see line 27 of column 2), this statement, when taken in context with the statement made later in column 2, lines 39-40 ("well controlled in color tone") clearly indicates that Kondo is teaching that a colorless or nearly colorless laminate can be obtained using the ultra-fine particles, not a colored laminate. Thus, Kondo does not

provide the teaching that, when combined with the other references, makes the Applicant's invention obvious.

Kondo teaches that the ultra-fine particles used therein must be coated with an organic resin to overcome strong adhesion that is created between the PVB and the glass (column 4, line 28). This is not a problem created using the fine pigment chips as claimed in the process of the present invention.

As for Ulmann, the reference teaches that the pigments are to be dissolved rather than dispersed as fine solid particles in PVB resin binder. Again, the reference teaches away from the Applicant's claimed invention.

Phillips acknowledges the need to control the particle size, but does not describe the method for accomplishing this. Kondo does not describe the process for making the ultra-fine particles. Therefore, the combined references do not make it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art how to prepare the small pigment chips of the present invention.


GB '268 requires the presence of water but does not teach how to dry the composition obtained. The teachings of GB '268 would result in an unacceptable composition for use in the practice of the present invention, because the fabrication of PVB laminates is not tolerant of moisture. This is known to one of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore the teachings of GB '268 would not be combined as the Examiner has described by one of ordinary skill in the art looking to provide a process for making colored glass laminates using PVB.

For these reasons the Applicant does not believe that the cited references make the presently claimed invention obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the reasons for rejection of the Claims has been overcome. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1 - 3 be withdrawn, and instead that Claims 1 - 3 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



KEVIN S. DOBSON
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
REGISTRATION NO. 40,296
TELEPHONE: 302-892-5526

KSD

Dated: November 18, 2004